Senate Council Minutes October 18, 2004

The Senate Council met on Monday, October 18, 2004 at 3:00 pm in the Gallery of the Young Library and took the following actions.

1. Announcements

The Chair outlined several upcoming issues, including a proposed change to the Maternity Leave policy in Arts and Sciences, the need to get an update from Tearney regarding the progress of the Retiree Health Benefits subcommittee, a proposed change to the ARs regarding the Lecturer series, and a problem with restricted lower-level courses in Business and Economics that may have wider implications for the Senate Council to examine. The Chair promised to keep the Senate Council members informed of developments with these issues.

2. Approval of the Minutes from September 27, 2004

The Chair noted that he had made several changes to the minutes over the weekend to more accurately reflect the nature of the conversation at the end of the meeting. Several other Council members expressed interest in incorporating changes. Those changes will be forwarded to Ms. Scott and the minutes will be approved at the subsequent meeting. Cibull suggested that the Provost be asked to explain the policy that was purported to having been stated by the Provost in the section of the minutes in question. Cibull and Debski supported inviting the Provost to a Senate Council meeting, while the Chair suggested asking the Provost for a written policy statement.

3. LCC Liaison

The Chair thanked Tagavi for submitting a proposed compromise. Bailey suggested altering some of the language to "for the benefit of LCC". Moore suggested taking a more conservative approach when considering the formation of special relationships, and suggested the Senate Council should decide which issues are of concern to LCC rather than permitting the LCC liaison to make that decision. Bailey pointed out that the approval of the liaison was only for one year, and that any policy decision made at this meeting could be reviewed and altered at a future date, noting that permanently altering the composition of the Senate Council would require Senate approval. Cibull spoke in favor of inviting a liaison to attend every meeting, observing that sometimes what is or is not an LCC issue is not discernable until after the fact.

Dembo noted that three issues seemed to be at stake; the privilege of the floor, the ability to place items on the agenda, and the status of the liaison visar-vis the listserv. He noted that since visitors are frequently recognized and may speak and that anybody can ask the Chair to place an item on the agenda, he was not entirely sure to what the argument pertained.

Debski spoke in favor of the proposed compromise, noting that the policy could be revisited at the end of the academic year. She requested that Bailey's suggested language be included. Greissman suggested changing the wording to "for the mutual benefit of LCC and UK". Bailey agreed.

Tagavi made a motion to approve the language he suggested with the inclusion of the wording proposed by Bailey/Greissman. Duke seconded the motion, which passed without dissent. The approved wording is below:

- The LCC Liaison is for the remainder of the 2004-2005 academic year.
- The LCC Liaison is invited to attend and participate in any SC meeting for the mutual benefit of LCC and UK.
- The LCC Liaison shall receive notices of meetings and agenda items.

4. Definition of the meaning of "Medical Center"

Jones reminded the Senate Council members that during a previous Senate meeting the issue had been raised about which colleges constitute the Medical Center, now that the University has been moved to a Provost model. Jones noted that the Senator had suggested that perhaps the Academic Council of the Medical Center (ACMC) should be changed to the Academic Council of the Health Colleges, since the hospital is not part of the colleges of the medical center. Jones suggested charging the ACMC with examining this issue.

Cibull asked which Senator suggested the changes. Dembo replied that it was Perrier. Cibull noted that this issue has come up before during discussion of the relationship between the dean of the College of Medicine and the EVPHA. He noted that many clinical title faculty are very active in their clinical enterprises and not with academic pursuits. Cibull said that some of the issues regarding this division of authority related to the evaluation, promotion and salaries of the faculty.

Jones noted that these questions were much broader than the question at hand, which was merely to identify which colleges were part of the Medical Center. Cibull noted that the issues were related and wondered

where the new College of Public Health fit into the equation. Greissman agreed that the larger question regarded which issues were academic in nature versus which issues were matters of health affairs.

Tagavi suggested defining which colleges were colleges of the medical center and then including that list in the Senate Rules so that future changes to the definition would be more easily incorporated by simply adding or deleting a college. Jones noted that this question also impacts the Rules and Elections Committee's charge to make the Senate Rules reflect the Provost system and asked the Senate Council members to help answer this question.

Duke agreed with Jones' earlier recommendation that this issue be charged to the ACMC for its examination. Bailey asked if the ACMC should also consider its charge, since the definition and charge are interrelated. Debski noted that some discussion had begun regarding the need for an ACMC at all when some people felt that the Graduate Council could review the professional courses and programs, but that the conversation had not continued. Cibull said that the professional expertise of the ACMC was necessary, given the nature of the proposals it hears. He noted that the vast majority of Medical Center courses are highly specialized and required a different sort of consideration than was possible through the Graduate Council.

Ms. Scott read the charge of the ACMC from the Senate Rules. The Chair suggested that the ACMC's charge might help them address some of these issues. He asked the Council members if they would rather send the ACMC the narrow issue of defining which colleges were part of it, or if the broader issues should be part of the Senate Council's request. Jones suggested making the request as narrow as possible.

Jones made a **motion** to ask the Academic Council of the Medical Center to decide if its current name was appropriate, suggest a new name if not, and to state which colleges were part of it. Kaalund **seconded** the motion.

Cibull suggested inviting the Provost and the EVPHA to attend a Senate Council meeting to informally discuss their interaction as it relates to the faculty.

After brief discussion, the motion passed without dissent.

5. Employee Benefits Committee Nominees

The Chair said he would postpone the discussion of passing Employee Education Benefits to dependents until after the Employee Benefits Committee minutes were available. He asked the Senate Council members to review the list of nominees. Cibull nominated Carolyn Bratt. The Chair indicated she was interested in serving on the Retiree Health Benefits subcommittee but suggested she might be interested in serving on the EBC if not selected by Tearney for the RHB subcommittee. He noted that since the RHB subcommittee will make its recommendation to the EBC, perhaps serving on the EBC would allow Bratt a certain degree of oversight.

Cibull made a **motion** to nominate Bratt. Kaalund **seconded** the motion, which passed without dissent. Tagavi made a **motion** to nominate Goldman as an alternate, if Bratt as unwilling or unable to serve. Kaalund **seconded** the motion, which **passed** without dissent.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie Yanarella, Chair

Members present. Bailey, Cibull, Debski, Dembo, Duke, Jones, Kaalund, Kennedy, Moore, Tagavi, Yanarella.

Liaison present: Greissman

Prepared by Rebecca Scott on October 21, 2004